

**United States Environmental Protection Agency
Criminal Investigation Division
Investigative Activity Report**

Case Number:

0700-0563

Case Title:

Cass County PWSD 9

Subject of Report:

Report of Interview with (b) (6), (b) (7) on 01-04-2018

Reporting Office:

Kansas City Area Office

Activity Date:

January 4, 2018

Reporting Official and Date:

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Resident Agent in Charge

11-JAN-2018, Signed by: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Approving Official and Date:

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Assistant Special Agent in Charge

17-JAN-2018, Approved by: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Assistant Special Agent in Charge

SYNOPSIS

On January 4, 2018, U.S. EPA CID SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and MDNR Investigator (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) interviewed (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), Cass County Board PWSD #9 member. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) provided information concerning his tenure on the Board and recent events concerning allegations that District Supervisor (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was not properly collecting drinking water samples in the District.

DETAILS

On January 4, 2018, U.S. EPA CID Special Agent ("SA") (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and Missouri Department of Natural Resources Investigator ("Investigator") (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) interviewed (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) ("(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)"). This interview was conducted at (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) employer, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) Harrisonville, MO. After SA (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and Investigator (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) identified themselves and explained the nature of the interview, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) provided the following information.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) has been on the Cass County Board PWSD #9 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), having been re-elected (b) (6), (b) (7)(C). (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) first became part of the board when a former board member moved out of state and asked (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) to take his place. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) is a civic-minded person and had previously served on the (b) (6), (b) (7)(C).

The Cass County PWSD #9 board met once per month. This was a "hands-off" board, as every member had a job, aside from the board. The Cass County PWSD #9 seemed to run itself well.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) ("(b) (6), (b) (7)(C)"), had been running the Cass County PWSD for over (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) years. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) considered (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) a friend and had known him his whole life.

Last year, starting with a board meeting in May of 2017, there was a lot of "tattle-telling" going on. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) did not like this disgruntled employee situation. Everyone had allegations about everyone else. Allegations were brought up concerning (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) collection of drinking water samples. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) saw this as an issue but certainly did not feel they were "pedaling unsafe water." (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) never heard of any bad water in the district and subsequent samples taken "correctly" showed that the water was safe. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) indicated to the board that he corrected this issue by having others collect the water samples. The board tasked (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and the other employees to figure out the personnel issues and revisit the issues at the November 2017 board meeting, which they did.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) did not see the tablet issue as a big deal. He had spoken to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) who indicated that he had purchased it a long time ago for board business. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was asked to pay back the approximately \$600.00.

(b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was asked about a comment that (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) had allegedly made to the board about (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) paying back the board when the board paid back the board. According to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C), this comment referred to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) purchase of Christmas packages of meats for the board members while utilizing the board (b) (6), (b) (7)(C).

This document contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the EPA.
It is the property of the EPA and is loaned to your agency;
it and its contents are not to be distributed outside your agency.

**United States Environmental Protection Agency
Criminal Investigation Division
Investigative Activity Report**

Case Number:

0700-0563

finances. (b) (6), (b) had received this Christmas package for the last eight years, but not this year.

(b) (6), (b) had a lot of respect for [REDACTED] and he was closest to him out of any of the board members. (b) (6), (b) was his biggest supporter. However, it was his opinion that [REDACTED] was not doing things right. He told [REDACTED] that he considered him a friend "but damn-it, why are you doing this to me." (b) (6), (b) told [REDACTED] that he was not blind and stupid. (b) (6), (b) stated that he appreciated that samples showed that the water was fine, but had it not been, the residents of the county would not have known that. [REDACTED] did not admit to not collecting samples to him. It bothered (b) (6), (b) that [REDACTED] did not "own up to it," noting that sometimes people have a hard time admitting when they have done something wrong. (b) (6), (b) stated that he had a pretty good idea that all county samples came out of (b) (6), [REDACTED] kitchen sink. (b) (6), (b) opined that [REDACTED] did this to save time and it was just laziness.

The board took harsh action figuring that [REDACTED] deserved a punishment that would sting a little and to let him know he didn't get away with anything. The board mandated that [REDACTED] take the month of January off without pay. By not paying [REDACTED] the board in effect was made whole as to the fees associated with the aforementioned tablet.

When asked why the board had not alerted the Missouri Department of Natural Resources about the situation with the sampling, (b) (6), (b) advised that they testing showed that their water was fine and "you hate to call the dogs on yourself."

(b) (6), (b) advised that [REDACTED] makes a salary of over \$100,000.00.

No further information was requested at this time.